UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/425,436	10/22/1999	RICHARD ROBERT CAPPADONA	7015/66635	9564
	7590 07/11/200 FABIN AND FLANN I	EXAMINER		
	A SALLE STREET	BECKER, DREW E		
SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL	60603-3406	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/425,436	CAPPADONA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Drew E. Becker	1794						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth it ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(fextensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
NOTICE OF APPEAL								
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.)	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause					
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	•	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1)		ected claims.						
4. \square The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. $oxed{\boxtimes}$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	the 112(1) rejections of caims 24-2	<u>26, 29-30</u> .						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	-					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 2-6 and 8-19. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 20-26,29 and 30. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	kpianation of					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:					
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
	/Drew E Becker/							
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1794						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the new issues inloude the changes to claim 24 as well as new claims 31-32.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that "waterless cooking" would have been known to one of ordinary skill in the art to include "subatmospheric pressure". However, the specification makes not mention of pressure values and does not provide a specific meaning for the term "waterless cooking". Therfore, it has been given its broadest reasonable interpretation to mean simply cooking without water, as noted in the BPAI decision of 2/21/07. Regarding claim 20, it merely requires a device "configured for stove top waterless cooking applictions at sub-atmospheric pressure". Claim 20 is an apparatus claim, therefore this is merely an intended use of the apparatus. Clearly, DE 7527182 teaches a pot and lid without vents and therefore would be capable of attaining sub-atmospheric pressures. Also, Barbour et al teach a device with vents which can be covered (Figure 10, #52 & 66; column 5, line 37). Claim 23 is a method claim, however the rejection also relies upon Hupf et al, which teaches a method of cooking in this manner as noted in paragraph 7 of the finbal rejection. Regarding the declaration of Mr. Verrette submitted on 1/31/08, there is no evidence showing that the currently rejetced claim limitations were sole reason for the increased sales. It is quite probable that the limitations of previously allowed claims 2-6 and 8-19 were the cause of the increased sales.